

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/771,379	01/25/2001	Alan Metcalfe	D5045-00003	6447
7590 08/28/2006		EXAMINER		
Robert E. Rosenthal			POINVIL, FRANTZY	
Duane, Morris &	& Heckscher LLP			
Suite 4200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
One Liberty Place			3628	
Philadelphia P			****	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/771,379	METCALFE, ALA	METCALFE, ALAN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Frantzy Poinvil	3628					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sl	neet with the correspondence a	ddress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COM 136(a). In no event, however will apply and will expire SIX e, cause the application to be	MUNICATION. , may a reply be timely filed (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 J	une 2006						
<u> </u>	s action is non-final.						
<u>, </u>	, _						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 19-29 is/are pending in the application	on.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>19-29</u> is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requireme	ent.					
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	cepted or b) 🗌 objec	ted to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the at	tached Office Action or form P	PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	n priority under 35 U	.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
 Certified copies of the priority document 	 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 						
·	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
• •	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copi	es not received.					
Attachment(s)	4. □ 1	andow Summany (DTO 442)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		erview Summary (PTO-413) per No(s)/Mail Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	, · =	tice of Informal Patent Application (PT her:	ГО-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the Amendment filed 6/12/2006.

2. Claims 19-29 are allowable over the art of record.

3. This application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters:

As per claim 19, line 4, the word "things" renders the claim vague and indefinite because it is unclear as to what encompasses "things". On lines 6-7, the claim refers to a secondary interface when there was no previous recitation of a first interface. On lines 11-12, it is unclear as to what "intelligent database objects" are.

As per claim 20, the "fulfillment process" lacks clear antecedent basis.

As per claim 22, line 2, "an" before "activity" should be changed to - -the- -. On line 3, the phrase "and operating and said attributes and communications define that activity or item" appears to be confusing as not being grammatically correct. Also, on line 5, what does it mean by "meaningful described".

As per claim 23, lines 4 and 16, the word "things" and "thing" renders the claim vague and indefinite because it is unclear as to what encompasses "things". On line 5, the claim refers to "secondary interfaces" when there was no previous recitation of a first interface. Also, on line 5, it is unclear as to what "intelligent database objects" are. On line 9, "the operating rule" lacks clear antecedent basis. On line 13, the Examiner suggests changing the first occurrence of "the" to - -an- - . On line 15, the Examiner suggests changing the first occurrence of "the" to - -an- - . On line 19, "the fulfillment process" lacks clear antecedent basis. On line 22, "object" should be changed to - -objects- -.

Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this letter.

4. The prior art taken alone or in combination failed to teach or suggest "wherein the who/what, why/how and where/when information is input to the system through the secondary interface in a manner that conforms the common database objects to the common data format and operating rule such that why information + how information = where/when information as recited in claim 19.

The prior art taken alone or in combination failed to teach or suggest "wherein said who/what type, why/how and where/when information when processed by the system, according to the operating rule, works so that why information + how information = where/when information, to achieve the purpose of the intelligent database object as recited in independent claim 23.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantzy Poinvil whose telephone number is (571) 272-6797. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30AM to 6:00PM.

Art Unit: 3628

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sam Sough can be reached on (571) 272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Frantzy Poinvil **Primary Examiner**

Art Unit 3628

FP

August 18, 2006